

1 THE HONORABLE \_\_\_\_\_  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10 TACOMA DIVISION

11 EMMANUEL ONG, Individually and on  
12 Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.  
15

KITSAP RESIDENCES,

16 Defendant.  
17

NO. 3:22-cv-5095

**ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—  
COLLECTIVE ACTION**

**ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION**

18 Plaintiff Emmanuel Ong (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
19 situated, by and through his attorney April Rhéaume of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, for his  
20 Original Complaint—Collective Action (“Complaint”) against Defendant Kitsap Residences  
21 (“Defendant”), states and alleges as follows:

22 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS**

23 1. This is a collective action brought by Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all  
24 others similarly situated, against Defendant for violations of the overtime provisions of the Fair  
25 Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* (the “FLSA”), and the provisions of the  
26

1 Washington Minimum Wage Act, RCW 49.46.010, *et seq.*, and Washington Rebate Act, RCW  
 2 49.52.050 (collectively, the “Washington Acts”).

3 2. Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages,  
 4 prejudgment interest, and a reasonable attorney’s fee and costs as a result of Defendant’s policy  
 5 and practice of failing to pay proper overtime compensation under the FLSA and the  
 6 Washington Acts.

7 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8 3. The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington has  
 9 subject matter jurisdiction over this suit under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this  
 10 suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

12 4. This Complaint also alleges violations of the Washington Acts, which arise out  
 13 of the same set of operative facts as the federal cause of action; accordingly, this Court has  
 14 supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s Washington state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
 15 1367(a).

17 5. Plaintiff was employed by and performed work for Defendant in Kitsap County.  
 18 Therefore, venue is proper within the Tacoma Division of the Western District of Washington  
 19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

20 **III. THE PARTIES**

21 6. Plaintiff is an individual and resident of Kitsap County.

22 7. Defendant is a domestic, nonprofit corporation.

24 8. Defendant’s registered agent for service of process is Sharon Stiffey, at 2505  
 25 Southeast Mile Hill Drive, Unite 201, Port Orchard, Washington 98366.

26 9. Defendant maintains a website at <https://kitsapresidences.org/>.

#### **IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

11. Defendant employs two or more individuals who engage in interstate commerce or business transactions, or who produce goods to be transported or sold in interstate commerce, or who handle, sell, or otherwise work with goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for interstate commerce.

12. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than \$500,000.00 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately stated) in each of the three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint.

13. At all times material herein, Plaintiff has been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA and the Washington Statutes.

14. Defendant employed Plaintiff as a Direct Support Staff member from August of 2013 until January of 2022.

15. Defendant classified Plaintiff as nonexempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and paid him an hourly wage.

16. Defendant also employed other hourly-paid employees to perform the work necessary to its business (hereinafter referred to as "Hourly Employees").

17. Defendant directly hired Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees, controlled their work schedules, duties, protocols, applications, assignments and employment conditions, and kept at least some records regarding their employment.

18. In addition to his hourly wage, Plaintiff regularly received bonuses.

19. These bonuses were based on objective criteria.

1       20. Plaintiff expected to receive the bonuses and did in fact receive the bonuses on  
 2 a regular basis.

3       21. Upon information and belief, all or most Hourly Employees received bonuses.

4       22. Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees regularly or occasionally worked in excess  
 5 of forty hours per week throughout their tenure with Defendant.

6       23. Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees 1.5 times their base hourly  
 7 rate for the hours they worked over 40 in a workweek.

8       24. However, Defendant did not include the bonuses that were paid to Plaintiff and  
 9 other Hourly Employees in their regular rates when calculating their overtime pay even though  
 10 Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees received bonuses in pay periods in which they also  
 11 worked in excess of forty hours per week.

13       25. 29 C.F.R. § 778.208 requires that all forms of compensation, such as  
 14 nondiscretionary bonuses, “must be totaled in with other earnings to determine the regular rate  
 15 on which overtime pay must be based.”

17       26. Defendant violated the FLSA and the Washington Statutes by not including all  
 18 forms of compensation, such the nondiscretionary bonuses of Plaintiff and other Hourly  
 19 Employees, in their regular rate when calculating their overtime pay.

20       27. Upon information and belief, Defendant’s pay practices were the same for all  
 21 Hourly Employees who received incentive bonuses.

22       28. Upon information and belief, the pay practices that violate the FLSA alleged  
 23 herein were the same at all of Defendant’s facilities because the policy was a centralized human  
 24 resources policy implemented uniformly from the corporate headquarters.

29. Because of the volume of work required to perform their jobs, Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees consistently worked in excess of forty hours per week.

30. Defendant did not provide Plaintiff with rest breaks as required by the Washington Statutes.

31. Defendant did not provide Plaintiff with thirty-minute lunch breaks as required by the Washington Statutes.

32. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff and other Hourly Employees violated the FLSA and the Washington Statutes.

## V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

33. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

34. Plaintiff brings this claim for relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all persons similarly situated as hourly employees who were, are, or will be employed by Defendant within the applicable statute of limitations period, who are entitled to payment of the following types of damages:

A. Regular wages and overtime premiums for all hours worked over forty hours in any week;

- B. Liquidated damages; and
- C. Attorney's fees and costs

35. Plaintiff proposes the following collective under the FLSA:

**All hourly employees who received a bonus in connection with work performed in at least one week in which they worked over forty hours within the past three years.**

1       36. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiff has filed  
2 or will soon file a written Consent to Join this lawsuit.

3       37. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which  
4 Plaintiff's Original Complaint—Collective Action was filed herein and continues forward  
5 through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a), except as set forth herein below.

6       38. The members of the proposed FLSA collective are similarly situated in that they  
7 share these traits:

8           A. They were paid hourly;  
9           B. They were eligible for and received nondiscretionary bonuses;  
10           C. They worked over forty hours in at least one week in which they performed work  
11 related to a bonus; and

12           D. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of failing to pay a proper  
13 overtime rate for hours worked over forty in a week.

14       39. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the collective but believes that the  
15 collective exceeds fifty persons.

16       40. Defendant can readily identify the members of the collective, who are a certain  
17 portion of the current and former employees of Defendant.

18       41. The names and physical and mailing addresses of the probable FLSA collective  
19 action plaintiffs are available from Defendant.

20       42. The email addresses of many of the probable FLSA collective action plaintiffs  
21 are available from Defendant.

1

**VI. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**(Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)**

2

3

43. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as  
though fully set forth herein.

4

5

44. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the  
FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*

6

7

45. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an enterprise  
engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

8

9

46. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to pay a  
minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay 1.5 times their regular  
wages for all hours worked over 40, unless an employee meets certain exemption requirements  
of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying DOL regulations.

10

11

47. Defendant classified Plaintiff as nonexempt from the requirements of the FLSA.

12

13

48. Despite Plaintiff's entitlement to overtime payments under the FLSA, Defendant  
failed to pay Plaintiff 1.5 times his regular rate for all hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

14

15

49. Defendant knew or should have known that its actions violated the FLSA.

16

17

50. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful.

18

19

51. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for  
monetary damages, liquidated damages and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees provided  
by the FLSA for all violations which occurred beginning at least three years preceding the filing  
of Plaintiff's initial complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling.

20

21

52. Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to believe its  
actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and, as a result thereof, Plaintiff is  
entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid

22

23

24

25

26

overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

53. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in failing to pay Plaintiff as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

**VII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF  
(Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)**

54. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

55. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief on behalf of all similarly situated employees pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*

56. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

57. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay 1.5 times their regular wages for all hours worked over 40 each week, unless an employee meets certain exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

58. Defendant classified Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees as nonexempt from the overtime provisions of the FLSA.

59. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees 1.5 times their regular rate for all hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

60. Defendant deprived Plaintiff and similarly situated employees of compensation for all of the hours worked over forty per week, in violation of the FLSA.

61. Defendant knew or should have known that its actions violated the FLSA.

62. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful.

63. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and  
larly situated employees for monetary damages, liquidated damages and costs, including  
able attorney's fees provided by the FLSA for all violations which occurred beginning at  
ree years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's initial complaint, plus periods of equitable

64. Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to believe its actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and, as a result thereof, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

65. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in failing to pay Plaintiff and the collective members as provided by the FLSA, they are entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

## **VIII. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claim for Violation of the Washington Acts)**

66. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

67. The Washington Minimum Wage Act (“MWA”), provides that all nonexempt employees are required to be paid at or above the applicable minimum wage rate for all hours worked. RCW 49.46.020.

68. All hours worked over 40 in a workweek must be paid at 1.5 times the nonexempt employee's regular rate of pay. *See* RCW 49.46.130(1).

1       69.    “No employee shall be required to work more than five consecutive hours  
 2 without a meal period.” WAC 296-126-092(2). A violation of the meal period requirement is “a  
 3 wage violation.” *Hill v. Garda CL Nw., Inc.*, 198 Wn. App. 326, 360-61 (2017). Similarly, an  
 4 employee must be provided with ten-minute paid rest break for every four hours worked and  
 5 must not work more than three consecutive hours without a rest break. WAC 296-126-092(4).  
 6 A denial of compliant rest breaks is also a wage violation. *Wingert v. Yellow Freight Sys., Inc.*,  
 7 146 Wn.2d 841 (2002).

8       70.    The meal break may be unpaid if the worker receives an uninterrupted meal  
 9 period of at least 30 minutes during which they are completely relieved of work duties.  
 10 However, if the employer intrudes upon or infringes the mandatory thirty-minute term to any  
 11 extent, workers are owed compensation for the full thirty-minute period. *Alvarez v. IBP, Inc.*,  
 12 339 F.3d 894, 913-914 (9th Cir. 2003); L&I Admin. Policy ES.C.6.1 at 3-4.

13       71.    The Washington Wage Rebate Act, Wash. Rev. Code § 49.52.050, provides in  
 14 relevant part that any employer who “willfully and with intent to deprive the employee of any  
 15 part of his wage, shall pay any employee a lower wage than such employer is obligated to pay  
 16 such employee by any statute, ordinance or contract” shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. There  
 17 is a presumption that any underpayment of an employee’s wages was willful. Wash. Rev. Code  
 18 § 49.52.080.

21       72.    Wash. Rev. Code § 49.52.070 provides that any employer who violates the  
 22 provisions of Wash. Rev. Code § 49.52.050 shall be liable in a civil action for twice the amount  
 23 of wages withheld, and attorneys’ fees and costs

73. The Wage Rebate Act entitles an employee to recover "twice the amount of the wages unlawfully rebated or withheld by way of exemplary damages, together with the costs of suit and a reasonable sum for attorney's fees." RCW 49.52.070.

74. Defendant acted willfully in violating the Washington state laws discussed herein and Plaintiff is entitled to double the actual damages. RCW 49.52.070.

75. In failing to compensate Plaintiff at 1.5 times his regular rate for all hours worked over 40 each week, Defendant violated the Washington state laws referenced above.

76. In failing to provide Plaintiff with lunch breaks and rest breaks, Defendant violated the Washington state laws referenced above.

77. Plaintiff has and will continue to suffer loss of income and other damages. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to recover unpaid wages owed, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and other appropriate relief under Washington state laws.

## **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Emmanuel Ong, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, respectfully prays that Defendant be summoned to appear and to answer this Complaint and for declaratory relief and damages as follows:

A. Declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices alleged in this Complaint violate the FLSA, the Washington Acts and their related regulations;

B. Certification of a collective under Section 216 of the FLSA of all individuals similarly situated, as further defined in any motion for the same;

C. Judgment for damages suffered by Plaintiff and others similarly situated for all unpaid overtime wages under the FLSA, the Washington Acts and their related regulations;

D. Judgment for liquidated damages owed to Plaintiff and all others similarly situated pursuant to the FLSA, the Washington Acts and their related regulations;

E. An order directing Defendant to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated interest, a reasonable attorney's fee and all costs connected with this action; and Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

**EMMANUEL ONG, Individually  
and on Behalf of All Others  
Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFF**

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC  
Kirkpatrick Plaza  
10800 Financial Centre Pkwy, Suite 510  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211  
Telephone: (800) 615-4946  
Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

April Rhéaume  
Wash. Bar No. 57119  
[april@sanfordlawfirm.com](mailto:april@sanfordlawfirm.com)